The ABROGATION OF The Jewiſh Sabbath, OR Sabbath of the 7th day of the week.

Together,

With ſome brief Obſervations upon two ſmall Treatiſes:

1. *The unchangeable Morality of the 7th day Sabbath.* Written by *T. S.*
2. *The Morality of the fourth Commandment.*

In proſecution whereof, ſundry Scriptures are opened and cleered.

By *William Aſpinwall.*

Prov. 18. 7. *He that is firſt in his own cauſe,* ſeemeth *juſt; but his neighbor cometh, and ſearcheth him.*

Printed at *London,* by *J. C.* for *Livewel Chapman,* at the Crown in Popes-head-Alley. 1657.

BRITISH MUSEUM

WHen Truth is decried, and Error is advanced in its place, it behoves the Children of Wisdom to justifie the one, and bear witness against the other. Had not this been the case at this day, this little Treatise had not seen the light. Yea, when I considered how difficult it would be to reprove an Error (taken up by men otherwise Godly) without grieving the Spirits of some that are more tenderly conscientious, or strengthening the hands of the sons of Violence against them, I was almost discouraged from publishing thereof: and for some good season the publication hath been deferred. Till at length, being excited by some precious Saints, to divulge the same for the good of others, and of them more especially that have been misled, or may yet be unsetled in this Point; I resolved to send it abroad in that plain and homely dress as first it was prepared: avoiding, with all care and diligence, any expressions that might grieve or offend such Brethren as have been drawn aside in this particular, so far as it may stand with a faithful and impartial witness-bearing to the Truth. Which being a task very difficult, and such as needs a great measure of the Spirit of Wisdom and Love; to conduct in the handling thereof, I judge it necessary for me, in sense of mine own weakness and insufficiency, to look up to him who giveth liberally, and upbraideth not: and therefore desire our dissenting Brethren, if possibly they may meet with any thing that may seem to have any other appearance, they would candidly interpret my words, and know my intention is not to grieve or wound; but to cure and heal any that are gone astray: and accordingly, with a Spirit of Love to read and receive, what is here tendered to them in Love.

It is far from my purpose, to stir up or strengthen the hands of men in power to smite with the fist of wickedness such as dissent in judgement (and it may be in practise too) from themselves, and others also that are Godly, in this point. I rather judge it a duty, to bear witness against such a persecuting and Anti-christian Practise, as utterly repugnant to Gospel-principles. Goals and Prisons have been the usual arguments, wherewith the adversaries of the truth, have been wont to dispute against Saints. So doth not Christ. When he comes to deal with the world for sin, he sends them not to Goals and Prisons: but sends his Spirit to convince them of their Errors. And in this very case of the Sabbath, *when some Brethren did (in a time of great straights and necessity) take boldness to violate the day of* rest: *what did good* Nehemiah, *Neh.* 13. 15. *in this case? Did he exercise power as the Tirshatha or chief Governor, to commit them to Goals and Prisons? verily,* No. *He rather, like his Lord and Master Christ, reasons the matter with them, and rebukes their transgression, shewing them the danger thereof, and what wrath it would bring upon* Israel. *And when that did not prevail, but they still persisted to bring their wares, and lodged*

once

once and again without the gates, (which he for prevention had caused to be kept shut) yet he fell not fonl upon them forthwith, but testifieth against them, and debates the matter with them, before he did so much as threaten to put forth an Act of Power. Indeed, after due means used to convince their consciences, he declares, That if they will still persist in such an open breach of the Rest, after so many admonitions and means of conviction used; he then would exercise Power to curb that open breach of the Command, which a Magistrate, as an Heir of restraint, may do. He may command the gates of the City to be shut, as Nehemiah did, to prevent the carrying in or out of Goods upon that day. He may (pro tempore, during the day of Rest) seize such Goods as are brought for sale, to prevent the profanation of the day of Rest. And by the same proportion, he may cause any shops to be shut up, as shall be set open upon that day of Rest; or restrain such persons as would wilfully (after divers admonitions and due means of conviction used) do servile works upon that day. This, as an Heir of restraint, he may do: But to exercise Acts of Power upon the outward man, until due means have been used to inform and convince conscience: yea, after all that hath been done, to throw men into Prisons, and there to detain them from their Families & from their lawful Callings, upon the other days appointed for labor; and by such means to maintain a company of ungodly Jaylors, out of other mens Estates, is a most unchristian, I may justly call it, Antichristian practice, and worthy to be born witness against, as a lording it, not only over the Bodies and Estates of their Brethren; but over their Consciences also. And let such as are in place of Power, beware how they meddle with any of Christ's little Flock, and see they deal with them as Christ himself would do in the like case, and as themselves should do, if they would be reputed the Servants of Christ, and Rulers for him: Otherwise, let them be assured, Christ will tender such little Ones, how weak soever they be, and rebuke those that do them wrong. And better were it for such Rulers, that a milstone were hanged about their necks, and that they were cast into the Sea; then that they should offend any one of Christ's little ones. On the other side, let me perswade such Brethren, that they offend not the Lord and their fellow-Brethren, by vilifying and violating the Lord's day, calling it the whores Sabbath; or by doing their own works thereon, lest they suffer as evil doers. For though Conscience may be some excuse for their observance of the seventh day, till God come in with further Light; yet Conscience can be no excuse for them, to blaspheme or violate that day of Rest, which their Brethren count the Lord's day; and in obedience to the Command, do observe as a day of holy Rest: yea, those of their own judgement, do acknowledge that the whole stream of the godly, are for the observance of our Lord's day. I shall therefore shut up this Preface with a word of advice (both to Rulers, and to our dissenting Brethren) in the words of the Apostle, Let your moderation appear to all men: the Lord is at hand.

The

The SEVENTH-DAY-SABBATH abrogated.

COL. 2. 16, 17.

16. *Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast, or of the new moons, or of the sabbaths:*
17. *Which are a shadow of things to come, but the body* [is] *of Christ.*

THE scope of the Apostle (as in other Epistles to other Churches, so) in this, is to strengthen the Gentile-Christians, against the slie insinuations of Jewish Teachers; whose endeavour was to bring the Gentile Christians unto the Jewish Pædagogy. Now to preserve them from being seduced, he sweetly insinuates unto them the perfection that is in Christ, and in all his Institutions. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are compleat in him; and therefore no need you should be carried back to *Moses*, vers. 9. 10. Moreover, he sheweth the excellency of Gospel-institutions above the institutions of *Moses*, in regard of the spiritual nature of them; and instanceth in Circumcision and Baptism; comparing them together, *vers.* 11, 12, 13. Thirdly, he dissuadeth them from *Mosaical* Ceremonies and shadows, and proveth the abrogation and nullity of them all, by this one instance of days of worship, ennumerating all the days of instituted worship amongst the Jews. From whence it will follow, That if the times of legal worship be abrogated, then the worship it self also, and all appendixes thereof. Now that the days or times of publick instituted worship are abolished, the Apostle proveth by

the nature of them, *They are all but one ſhadow of things to come*, verſ. 17. And all men know; yea, Reaſon it ſelf may dictate ſo much to us, That when the ſubſtance is come, the ſhadow muſt needs vaniſh. For ſhadows are of things to come, as the Apoſtle reaſons, and not of things paſt or preſent. I ſhall briefly come therefore to the words of the Text, from whence we may argue thus:

All ſhadows of things to come, that repreſent ſomewhat of the body of Chriſt, when Chriſt the body (or ſubſtance) is come, do vaniſh, and are to be aboliſhed.

But Feaſts, new Moons and Sabbaths, even all the days of Jewiſh publick inſtituted worſhip, are ſhadows, or all together make up one entire ſhadow of Chriſt, the body or ſubſtance:

And therefore, Chriſt being come, they do all vaniſh, and are aboliſhed.

The *major* is evident. For when the ſubſtance of thoſe ſhadows, to wit, the body of Chriſt is come, and hath fulfilled the thing ſignified by them, then there is no need of a ſhadow; becauſe ſhadows are of things to come, as the Apoſtle reaſoneth in the Text, and not of things preſent or paſt. And ſo Mr. *Spittlehouſe* in that Treatiſe of the ſeventh-day-Sabbaths Morality, doth acknowledge, *pag.* 19. Wherefore the retaining of the ſhadow doth proclaim, that the ſubſtance, to wit, the body of Chriſt is not yet come.

The *minor* is proved by the Apoſtle in the Text, by an induction of particulars, or a particular enumeration of all the kindes of holy Aſſemblies for publick worſhip inſtituted to the Jews; namely, Feaſts, New Moons and Sabbaths, which were all the days that Chriſt (by *Moſes*) appointed for publick worſhip, as appears *Ezek.* 45.17. *And it ſhall be the princes part* [to give] *burnt-offerings, and meat-offerings, and drink-offerings, in the feaſts, and in the new Moons, and in the ſabbaths, even in all their ſolemn aſſemblies.* And leſt any ſhould think, that by Sabbaths, in the Plural Number, is not meant the Sabbaths or Reſt upon the ſeventh-day of the week, (as the Author of that Treatiſe above mentioned would perſwade men to believe) let him read *Hoſ.* 2.11. where the Prophet maketh the very ſame diſtribution of days appointed for publick worſhip; ſaying, *I will alſo cauſe her mirth to ceaſe, her feaſt day her new moon, and her ſabbath: even every holy aſſembly of hers:* ſpeaking in the ſingular Number; to ſhew, that every of her Sabbaths, even the ſeventh-day-Sabbath as well as any other

Sab-

Sabbath (for *That*, by way of excellency, is called *the Sabbath*) ſhall ceaſe, as to the publick outward obſervance of the ſame, during the time of the Captivity. And from both Scriptures it is evident, that all their days of publick worſhip were ranked into theſe three ſorts, namely, Feaſts, New Moons and Sabbaths, even as the Apoſtle here reckons them up in the Text; ſaying of them all, *they are a ſhadow of things to come, the body (or ſubſtance) being Chriſt.*

The word σκιὰ, as Mr. *Leigh* (out of *Piſcator*) obſerves, doth ſignifie, *Adumbrationem, ſeu rudem delineationem, qualem carbone facere ſolent Pictores, imaginem aliquem picturi:* A dark ſhadow, or rude draught, ſuch as Painters are wont to make when they are about to draw a figure. *Crit. Sacr.*

Queſt. Now it may be asked, What did all theſe days of publick worſhip ſhadow forth, touching the body of Chriſt to come? they being (as the Apoſtle ſaith) but one entire ſhadow of the body of Chriſt.

Anſw. For anſwer hereunto, I ſhall a little unfold the words of the Text; and the rather, becauſe the Author of that Treatiſe hath omitted it. The Relative (ἅ) which is of the plural number, and comprehendeth Feaſts, new Moons and Sabbaths, even all of them: which being put together, do make up but one ſhadow or rude draught of things to come. Now what are thoſe things to come? or, what is the ſubſtance of thoſe ſhadows? To this the Apoſtle anſwereth in the laſt words of that Verſe, *The body of Chriſt, or his humane nature.* For ſo I take thoſe words as an anſwer, to ſatisfie ſuch as might enquire what the Apoſtle meant, by a ſhadow of things to come.

Queſt. Yet ſtill it will be ſaid, What particulars touching the body of Chriſt; did thoſe Ceremonial days adumbrate or ſhadow forth?

Anſw. This being the main Query, and moſt neceſſary to lead us to a right underſtanding of the Apoſtles ſcope in this Text, I ſhall endeavour, in anſwer hereunto, to ſhew you what particulars all theſe Feaſts, new Moons and Sabbaths did ſhadow concerning the body or humane nature of Chriſt, ſpeaking to every of them in their due order. And firſt I ſhall begin with the Feaſts, which were in number three; namely, *Tabernacles, Paſſeover, Pentecoſt*: all of which, as touching the time and other circumſtances, did ſhadow forth ſomething of the body of Chriſt.

How the Feast of tabernacles was a shadow.

The Feast of Tabernacles, which was to begin upon the 15th day of the 7th Month, *Lev.*23.34. and to be observed eight days, did shadow forth two things touching the body or humane nature of Christ. The first day of this Feast, did shadow forth the very time and day of the Month, wherein Jesus Christ the Messiah should be born into the world, as we may perceive by the Apostles allusion to that Feast, *John* 1.14. *The word was made flesh, and* ἐσκήνωσεν *tabernacled amongst us.* He was made flesh at his conception, and at his birth he tabernacled amongst us. And that this was really accomplished in the birth of Jesus, the Son of *Mary* (at that very Feast) was so known unto the very Jews of that Age, that none of them then living, nor any since, durst deny the Truth of it. And as the first day did shadow forth his birth, so the eighth day did shadow out the Circumcision of Christ, as to be upon that very day, according to the Law. Both these days are called *Sabbathon*, a Sabbatism or Rest, or as our Translation renders it, *a Sabbath*, *Lev.*23.39. Thus you see briefly what this Feast did shadow or prefigure touching the *Messiah* to come: for such was the wisdom of God to lead his ancient People by such kinde of Rudiments unto a cleer discerning of the promised Seed: so that when they should see such a Son as this, born of the Line of *David*, and conceived in an extraordinary manner by the Virgin, and that upon the first day of the week, and also at the new Moon: born also upon the feast-day of Tabernacles, and circumcised upon the last day of the same; suffering death upon the true day of Passeover; and lying in the Grave upon the SABBATH-day; and last of all, pouring out the Spirit in Gifts of Tongues, upon the day of *Pentecost*, they might be convinced that he was indeed the *Messiah* promised; and of whom all those Ceremonies were but shadows: for all these things concurring in one person, (as they did in Jesus the Son of *Mary* the Virgin) were a demonstrative proof of the *Messiah*, and might have convinced the Jews of that Age, had not their hearts been hardened, and their eyes blinded through the righteous Judgement of God.

How the Passeover was a shadow.

Secondly, The Feast of *Passeover*, which was celebrated upon the 15th day of the Month *Nisan*, was not only a commemoration of the Angels passing over the Israelites, when he slew the first-born in *Egypt*, (which also had a shadow in it) but the Apostle saith, *it is, or was a shadow of the body of Christ*, to wit, his death and offering up upon the Cross upon that very day: for though the Apostle,

poſtle, ſpeaking of the day whereon Chriſt ſuffered, *John* 19.14. calleth it the day of the preparation of the Paſſeover, or the day going before the Paſſeover, (as indeed it was) in regard of the ſuperſtitious tranſlation of days obſerved amongſt the Jews of that Age, (See *Munſters Heb. Calend.* pag. 127. and alſo in his *Epiſt. Nuncupat.*) yet without controverſie, our Lord Jeſus kept his own Law exactly, which required that the Lamb ſhould be ſlain upon the 14th day of *Niſan*, in the Afternoon; and to be eaten at even following, which was indeed the 15th day of the Month, and upon the very ſame day he was ſacrificed for us, being offered up upon the Croſs: ſo that the ſuperſtitious Jews killed their Paſchal Lamb, at the very ſame hour when the Lord Jeſus was ſlain upon the Croſs.

Thirdly, *Pentecoſt* was another of their Solemn Feaſts, celebrated fifty days after the Paſſeover: and it did ſhadow forth Chriſt's *ſitting on the right hand of the Majeſty on high*, when he ſent forth his Spirit in cloven Tongues, like as of fire, *Act.* 2.1, 2. which being accompliſhed the 50th day after his ſuffering, doth give us to underſtand, that that was the thing ſignified or ſhadowed forth by that Ceremony. For this we may take for a general Rule in accommodation of all *Moſes* ſhadows, *That it is the ſafeſt way to compare the Ceremony with the accompliſhment of it, in Chriſt:* as the Apoſtle *John* doth touching the Feaſt of Tabernacles, (as was ſhewed before) and that will guide us to a right diſcerning of the thing intended by that ſhadow.

How Pentecoſt was a ſhadow.

A general Rule.

Object. If it be objected, That the day of Pentecoſt that yeer when our Lord ſuffered, fell out upon the ſeventh day of the week, even as the firſt Pentecoſt in the Wilderneſs did, when the Law was given: and therefore Chriſt his ſitting down at the Father's right-hand, and pouring out of the Spirit, may rather ſeem to lead us to an obſervance of the ſeventh day for a Sabbath, then of the firſt day of the week, as Chriſtians generally do obſerve it.

Anſw. I anſwer, It is true, That the day of Pentecoſt, according to Chriſt's own inſtitution, hapned that yeer upon the ſeventh day of the week, as it alſo did when the Law was given on Mount *Sinai*. But if the words of that Text be duly weighed, *Act.* 2.1, 2. they will plainly ſhew us, That Chriſt's reſting at his Father's right-hand, and pouring forth of the Spirit, was not until that ſeventh day was fully ended or *fulfilled*, as the word συμπληροῦσθαι doth ſignifie. So that when the ſeventh day ended, and the firſt day begun, then

was

was the day of *Pentecoſt fully come*, as our Tranſlators render thoſe words: for whether you would chuſe to take that word *fully come*, to intend the end of the true day of Pentecoſt, or the beginning thereof, according to the obſervation of the Jews, ſtill it leads us to the end of the ſeventh day of the week, and beginning of the *firſt day*. Becauſe, as was ſaid before, the true day of Pentecoſt, according to *Moſes* inſtitution, fell out on the ſeventh day; but according to the ſuperſtitious Cuſtome of the Jews of that Age, it was obſerved on the firſt day of the week; and therefore the Apoſtle chuſeth ſuch a word, συμπληροῦσθαι, as may comprehend both, and ſhew us the very nick of time when this wonderful work was done, was, when the one day ended, and the other day began. As who ſhould ſay, In the conjuncture of the days, when the true day of Pentecoſt, according to the Law, was fulfilled; and the day of Pentecoſt (according to the Obſervation of the ſuperſtitious Jews of that Age) was newly begun, then were they in one place, *&c.* And for this cauſe, as I conceive, the Prepoſition συν, is there uſed. Wherefore that place in the *Acts* is ſo far from infringing the Reſt upon the firſt day of the week, that it fully eſtabliſheth it, and ſheweth us the very nick of time when our Lord began his Reſt, namely, when the ſeventh day of the week (the true day of Pentecoſt) was completed, and the firſt day of the week (then obſerved by the ſuperſtitious Jews) was begun. From which Reſt of Chriſt, whether initiated at his Reſurrection, or conſummated at his ſitting down at the Father's right-hand upon the *firſt day* of the week; we Chriſtians are to obſerve our days of Reſt or publick worſhip by vertue of the fourth Commandment. And thus you ſee, that all the Feaſts did ſhadow forth ſomething of the body of Chriſt, to wit, his Birth, Circumciſion, Death, and Reſt at his Father's right-hand. In the next place I ſhall ſpeak of new Moons.

How New Moons are ſhadows.

Now as touching them, becauſe I meet with none that have accommodated this Ceremony, to ſhew us how it was a *ſhadow*, I ſhall (according to the general Rules aforementioned) compare the ſhadow and the accompliſhment of it in Chriſt, and ſo ſhew wherein the ſhadow lay.

It is a thing well known, that at the new Moons there is a conjunction or unioa (as I may ſay) of the two great Luminaries, the Sun and the Moon: which doth darkly ſhadow forth (as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh) the conjunction or union of the two natures of Chriſt in one perſon, when he was conceived in the Virgins wombe;

which

which accordingly was fulfilled at the change of the Moon, as may easily appear, if we reckon forty weeks backward from the day of Christ's birth upon the Feast of Tabernacles, which always was celebrated at the full Moon; and (as was shewed before) did shadow forth his birth. Now forty weeks backward from that full Moon when he was born, will carry you to the time of his conception at the new Moon.

I might here shew you, that the new Moon of Christ's conception that yeer, (being the 1422 yeer after the deliverance out of *Egypt*, and Leap-yeer, or Embolimical, according to the Jewish computation) fell out upon the seventh day of the week or Sabbath, and towards the end of that day, as *Mary* the Virgin was praying or meditating upon the Word, even in the very close of that day, and in the beginning of the first day of the week, the Angel appeared to her, and she conceived by the power of the holy Ghost overshadowing her.

I might further demonstrate it from the motions of the Sun and Moon, and the conjunction of those two Luminaries, which are God's faithful Witnesses in Heaven, as *David* calleth them: but because that such Demonstrations are not so easie for every vulgar capacity to apprehend, I shall refer the further designation of the day of the month, and day of the week, wherein Christ was conceived, unto its proper place, and speak more of it in the next section of Sabbaths and Sabbatisms.

Having now spoken of Feasts and new Moons, and shewed how they were *shadows* of the body of Christ, it remains to shew in the third place, how Sabbaths were *shadows* of his body also. Now you are to know, that there were four kindes of Sabbaths or Sabbatisms, and Rests amongst the Jews, and they did all of them shadow forth something of the body of Christ to come. And all these Sabbaths or Sabbatisms fell out in the seventh Month, except the Sabbath of the seventh day, which kept its constant revolution throughout all the Months of the yeer: Wherefore I shall speak of the Sabbath of the seventh day in the first place, as being the first in order and time, and by way of excellency called *the Sabbath*.

How Sabbaths are shadows.

The *Sabbath* of the seventh day of the week, as it is the seventh part of time, and doth commemorate the Lord's resting from his Work of Creation, was Moral, and depended upon the fourth Commandment. But as it held forth Christ's resting in the Grave, from all external and bodily actions, as upon that day, it is properly

and

and rightly calleſt by the Apoſtle, *a ſhadow*, touching ſomething of Chriſt to come. For all that are acquainted with the Story of Chriſt's death, do know, That the body of our Lord Jeſus lay onely that whole day in the Grave, and very little part either of the ſixth or of the firſt day. So that the reſting of Chriſt's body upon the ſeventh day-Sabbath, was the thing ſhadowed forth by the reſt and ceſſation from work upon the Jeweſh Sabbath. And therefore the Apoſtle reckons the Sabbath of the ſeventh day of the week, as well as other Sabbaths or Sabbatiſms, amongſt the ſhadows or Ceremonies of *Moſes*: yea, this more eſpecially.

Secondly, The firſt day of the ſeventh Month is called a Sabbatiſm or Reſt: our Tranſlation renders it *a Sabbath*, Lev. 23. 24. This day had a double ſhadow in it: firſt, as it was the new Moon, ſhadowing forth the conception of Chriſt, or the union of his two natures, as at that ſeaſon of the Moon, whereof I ſpake in the ſection of new Moons. But ſecondly, it did ſhadow forth to us the very day of the week whereon Chriſt was conceived. For that firſt day of the ſeventh Month was inſtituted in *memorial of blowing trumpets*, Lev. 23, 24. And of what blowing of Trumpets was it a memorial? Doubtleſs, it was a memorial of the Angels rejoycing and blowing their Trumpets the *firſt day* of the week, when God laid the foundations of the World, *Job.* 38. 7. for we read not of any other blowing of Trumpets in all the books of *Moſes*, whereof that ſhould be a memorial. Our Tranſlation reads it, *All the ſons of God ſhouted for joy.* But in the Original it is ſaid, *They blew the trumpets.* This firſt day therefore, God would have to be celebrated yeerly, to keep in memory his great Work, when he laid the foundations of the earth upon the *firſt day* of the week: and alſo to be *a ſhadow* of a far greater Work to be done as upon the ſame day of the week, namely, the union of the two natures of Chriſt in one perſon, which was the foundation of our eternal peace and happineſs.

And thus the Feaſt of Tabernacles became a ſhadow, to ſhew us upon what day of the week, this great and wonderful Work (or as *Iſaiah* calleth it, a WONDER) ſhould be done, namely, upon the
Iſa. 9. 6. ſame day of the week that God laid the foundations of the earth, which was the *firſt day*: Such is the perfect harmony of God's Works. And thus it pleaſed him to diſcipline his ancient People by ſuch kinde of Rudiments, that they might be clearly convinced, that Jeſus, the Son of *Mary*, in whom all things had their accompliſh-

pliſhment, was indeed the Meſſiah promiſed.

Thirdly, The tenth day of the ſeventh Month alſo, which was the day of their ſolemn publick Faſt, and was to be obſerved yearly; was not onely for humiliation, in regard of our firſt Parents tranſgreſſion upon that day; but alſo it ſerved to pre-figure the ſolemn humiliation of our Lord Jeſus, the ſecond *Adam*, for the firſt *Adam's* ſin immediately after he returned out of the Wilderneſs, where he had been tempted forty days of the Devil: this day in ſpecial is called *a Sabbath* of Reſt: and theſe are all the days, which by *Moſes* and the Prophets are called *Sabbaths*.

Fourthly and laſtly, The firſt and laſt days of Tabernacles are called *Sabbatiſms or Reſts*, Lev. 23. 39. And how theſe were *ſhadows*, hath been ſhewed in the ſection touching Feaſts. Now put all theſe together, *Feaſts, new Moons, Sabbaths*, and they make up but *one entire ſhadow of things to come*; or, ſeveral particulars touching the body of Chriſt; namely, the time of the Moon, and day of the week when he was conceived; the day of his Birth, and Circumciſion; his Humiliation for our firſt Parents ſin, which was the firſt publick action he did after his inauguration into his Office at his Baptiſm; the time and ſeaſon of his Death, and lying in the Grave; and his ſitting down at the Fathers right-hand. All which together, do make up a rude draught, or dark reſemblance of the Meſſiah to come. So that we cannot retain any one of theſe ſhadows, but we ſhall by conſequence deny the coming of Chriſt in the fleſh; and by our practice declare, that we, together with the Jews, do expect a Meſſiah to come. The conſideration whereof, might be ſufficient to deter any ſober Chriſtian ſpirit from taking up ſuch an Opinion.

I have enlarged the more upon the ſeveral particulars comprehended in the Text, (yet with as much brevity as I could) that it may appear to all unbyaſſed men, that all the days of publick worſhip appointed to the Jews, were all of them ſhadowy, and did hold forth ſomething of Chriſt the ſubſtance: and therefore to be abrogated: for that is the Apoſtles main ſcope, to prove the abrogation of all days of Jewiſh worſhip, together with the manner of their worſhip. To which end, he bringeth two Arguments chiefly: the one is taken from the ſhadowineſs of them, whereto I have already ſpoken: the other is fetched from Chriſt's conſummation of them, nailing them to his croſs, *Col.* 2. 14. whereunto I ſhall ſpeak a little more fully, when I come to anſwer the Treatiſe of the ſeventh day

Sabbath. In the mean while, let this be observed by the way, that since the fall of man, God would not have any day or time for instituted worship, but with respect to Christ, and such as should either prefigure or commemorate something of Christ: all the days of worship that the Jews had, did prefigure and shadow forth something of the body of Christ to come, as hath been proved. We Christians have only one day of publick instituted worship, to wit, *the Lords day*, and that commemorates the Resurrection of Christ, and his sitting down at the Father's right-hand. As for days of *Fast* and *Thanksgiving* (which are occasional only) they also are observed, either for the absence of Christ, manifested by some tokens of his displeasure; or for the presence of Christ with us, expressed by some signal appearances of his Grace and favour towards us.

By this which hath been said, you may see, that all the days of publick instituted worship amongst the Jews, whether *Feasts*, *new Moons*, or *Sabbaths*, were all of them *shadowy*, and therefore the substance, to wit, the body of Christ, being exhibited, do necessarily vanish, and are to be abolished. Let this therefore suffice to have spoken touching the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath, in regard of the shadowiness thereof, (which is the main scope I aimed at, to shew the unsoundness and invalidity of all Arguments alledged by our dissenting brethren, to prove the continuation of the Jewish Sabbath upon the seventh day of the week: for if it be *a shadow*, as the Apostle in express words speaketh, then it may not be continued after the substance is come, no more then any other *shadows* and Ceremonies may be.

Now having proved the abolition of the old *Jewish Sabbath*, it will be necessary to give some Ground for our Observation of the *first day* of the week or *Lords day*, which hath as firm an institution in the fourth Commandment, as ever the *Jewish Sabbath* had. For thus I argue:

That day whereon Jehovah rested from his works, we Christians ought to rest from ours. So saith the 4th Commandment, and *Heb.* 4.10.

But Jehovah our Redeemer rested from his works of Redemption upon the first day of the week, when he rose out of the Grave, and when he sate down at his Father's right-hand.

Therefore.

Now that his Resurrection was on the *first day of the week*,

is

is evident from all the Evangeliſts, and confeſſed by all: and that he ſate down at his Father's right-hand upon the ſame day, appeareth both by the *ſhadow* of it, the feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, and the fruit and effect of it, the pouring forth of the Spirit, according to that ſaying of Chriſt, *If I depart, I will ſend him to you*: namely, when I am aſcended, and ſet down at my Father's right-hand. And why could it not be before? verily, I can give you no Reaſon but this, That it was the Father's Pleaſure to reſerve that Royal Bounty and *Largeſſe* to be beſtowed by the Son himſelf, ſo ſoon as he was ſet down at the Father's right-hand in Glory; and had received all power, even power to ſend the Holy Ghoſt. By which gift the Diſciples themſelves ſhould be aſſured, that he was then entred into his Reſt, and had ſent forth his Spirit as a Pledge and Aſſurance thereof, according to that word, *If I depart, I will ſend him to you.* And had it not been for this Reaſon, the Father might have ſent, or the Lord Jeſus might have poured forth his Spirit upon the ſame day that he was taken out of their ſight. But that they might know he was corporally aſcended, and actually entred into his Reſt, and ſet down at his Father's right-hand, (*ſitting* being an Embleme of *Reſt*) he therefore reſerves that bounty until the day of *Pentecoſt* was fulfilled. *John* 16.7.

I might urge other Arguments to prove the *firſt day* of the weeks Reſt, from the breaking of Bread, and other Church-Acts, both from the Example of our Lord Jeſus and his Apoſtles, as appears from ſundry Scriptures in the New Teſtament: but I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of them in anſwer to that little Treatiſe of the perpetual, or unchangeable Morality of the ſeventh-day-Sabbath; whereunto I ſhall refer the Reader.

Obſervations upon the Book, called, *The Unchangeable Morality of the Seventh-day-Sabbath.*

Obſerv. 1. TWo things may be noted in the Title: firſt, the Epithet added unto Morality, to wit, *unchangeable*; which ſeems to import, that there may be ſome kinde of Morality that is changeable, though the Morality of the ſeventh-day-Sabbath be not. But becauſe the Author hath ſince renounced any ſuch diſtinction, as intended by him, I paſs it over as an over-ſight. Secondly, obſerve the Homonymy or equivocation of the word *ſeventh day*: for the ſeventh day, or ſeventh part of time may be meant as well of the firſt day of the ſeven as of the laſt; each day of the week being a ſeventh day, or ſeventh part of time. Now if you take the ſeventh day for a ſeventh part of time, accounting from the Inſtitutors Reſt, according as the fourth Commandment doth; then we own it for a truth, that from the time that the Lord of the Sabbath reſted from his proper work, we ought to celebrate the ſeventh day as a holy Reſt: and that is all which the fourth Precept doth command.

But if you appropriate it unto the ſeventh day of the week, as the Author of that Treatiſe doth, we deny it. We ſay, That the fourth Command, which we freely acknowledge to be Moral and unchangeable, doth not binde us Chriſtians to the obſervance of the ſeventh day of the week, as it formerly did the Jews: but it bindeth us now to the obſervation of the firſt day of the week, to wit, the *Lords day*: for the letter of the fourth Commandment, if it be well obſerved (whereſoever it is repeated by *Moſes*) doth not ſay, Remember the ſeventh day of the week is the Sabbath or Reſt of Jehovah thy God: but, Remember the ſeventh day, namely, that day of the ſeven wherein Jehovah thy God reſted: whether it be the firſt or the laſt day of the week, the Commandment doth not particularly determine; but the ſeventh day from the day of Jehovah's Reſt. And ſo the Commandment bindeth us Chriſtians as firmly to the obſervance of the firſt day of the ſeven, (which by way of excellency is called the *Lords day*) ever ſince our Lord Jeſus, the Lord of the Sabbath reſted from his own proper work, and entred into his Reſt *, as

*Heb. 4. 10.

for-

formerly it did binde the *Jews* unto the obſervance of the laſt day of the ſeven, wherein Jehovah the Creator reſted from his works. For the firſt day of the week, is the day wherein Chriſt our Redeemer reſted from his own works, to wit, the works of Redemption, whether we account it from the day of his Reſurrection, which was the inchoation of his Reſt, (as I may ſay) or from his ſitting down at his Fathers right-hand, when the day of *Pentecoſt* was compleated, which was the conſummation of his Reſt. It is true, The Commandment was obligatory to the Jews, as upon the laſt day of the ſeven, until Chriſt had fulfilled that ſhadow, by his reſting from labour in his Grave, becauſe that was the day of the week, whereon Jehovah reſted from his works of Creation. But when Chriſt had reſted from his own works (namely of Redemption) by his Reſurrection and ſitting down at his Father's right-hand, then doth the fourth Command binde us to keep the ſeventh day from that, as a Reſt or Sabbath, and none other. For ſo the Apoſtle ſheweth us, that there is another day of Reſt for the people of God, to be obſerved from the day or time, that our Lord Jeſus, (the Lord of the Sabbath, *Mar.* 2. 28.) ceaſed from his own works, namely, works of Redemption, as God did from his works, *Heb.* 4. 9, 10. And *David* ſpeaking of this day wherein Chriſt was mightily declared to be the Son of God, by the Reſurrection from the dead, and afterwards ſate down at his Father's right-hand in Glory, ſaith on this wiſe, *Pſal.* 118. 24. *THIS is the day which Jehovah hath made; we will rejoyce and be glad in it.* *Rom.* 1. 4.

And this may ſerve to anſwer them that cry out for a word of inſtitution for our *Lords day*, or *firſt day* of the weeks Reſt. For though ſome unadviſedly have granted, that we have not a word of precept, but onely examples and preſidents of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, for keeping the *firſt day* of the week, as a Reſt or Sabbath; yet the truth is, we have as firm an inſtitution for our *Lords day*, in the fourth Precept, as ever the *Jews* had for the ſeventh day. Since therefore the Lord, out of his infinite wiſdom, hath ſo penned the fourth Command, as the Reaſon of the binding part is applicable to the firſt day of the week, as well as to the laſt; let no man ſay, we want a word of inſtitution for it, ſeeing the Commandment it ſelf is an inſtitution: neither let them ſay, that the Command bindeth to the ſeventh day of the week: for that expreſſion is not in the Text; onely it bindes us to the obſervance of that day

in

in the week whereon *Jehovah* rested, accounting seven days from *Jehovah*'s Rest, be it on the *last day*, or be it on the *first day*, or upon any other, in case *Jehovah* had chosen to rest thereupon: for, as was said, The morality of the fourth Command doth not consist in the number of the days of the week; but in observance of that day of the week whereon the Lord himself rested from his work.

Thus much I thought good to speak in this place upon occasion of his ambiguous word, *seventh-day-Sabbath*: for we that observe the *Lords day*, or Sabbath, upon the *first day* of the week, do hold the Morality of the Sabbath every seventh day, though not beginning upon the last of the seven, as the Author of that Treatise doth; but upon the *first* of the seven, as the fourth Command requires, and all Christians do or should practice.

Observ. 2. The next thing I take notice of, is, That about one quarter of the Book (if I mistake not) is spent in proving the Title, and the residue is taken up in Objections and Answers. So that it is hard to say what the Book it self is: whether only a *Title*, or Answers unto certain Objections against a *Title*. But I pass by that uncouth method of the Author, as suiting well enough with the Subject he handleth; and so come briefly to that which seems to be most material in his discourse.

The Author in his Arguments for proof of his Title-page, urgeth the Dignity, Perpetuity and Extent of the Moral Law or Decalogue; which we do not in the least deny, but freely acknowledge. We say, That the Decalogue and every part thereof, is of perpetual force, and bindeth all persons in all Ages, Jews and Gentiles, and is a perfect Standard for all actions of Holiness and Righteousness. We are no *Antinomians*, as his Reasons brought to fortifie his third Argument, (*page* 3, 4.) might seem to imply. If the Author intended to cast such an imputation upon his Brethren, that dissent in judgement and practise from himself, in this particular, he is much too blame.

Observ. 3. Next, take notice of the weakness and unsoundness of the Author's Argument, *page* 4. where he saith, *That where the cause and reason of a Law is immutable, there the Law injoyning the same is immutable*, &c. I suppose the Authors meaning was to have said, That where the Cause and Reason of a thing is immutable, there the Law injoyning the same is immutable: or, where the Cause and Reason of a Law is immutable, there the Law it self is immuta-

ble:

ble: otherwiſe, his own words carry no good ſenſe. But ſo far as I can gueſs at his meaning by his words; I ſay, his Argument is invalid to prove a perpetuity of Reſt, upon the ſeventh day of the week; becauſe *Jehovah*, who reſted from Creating-works on the ſeventh day of the week, might, yea, did afterwards reſt from Redeeming-work on the *firſt day* of the week. Therefore his Argument cannot conclude a perpetuity, as touching the ſeventh day of the weeks Reſt, unleſs, firſt he had proved, That *Jehovah* cannot bring forth another work as great, and good, and glorious as Creation; and having finiſhed the ſame, to ceaſe from that work. The contrary whereunto, is moſt true: for *Jehovah* our Redeemer, undertook the work of our Redemption, which was as great, if not greater, then Creation; and to us, as good, and better: and having finiſhed the ſame, ceaſed from his own works, as God did from his, *Heb.* 4. 9, 10. Moreover, this Argument is corrupt and unſound, as well as weak, and may bring in the Jewiſh *Feaſt of Trumpets*, which was to be obſerved upon the *firſt day* of the ſeventh Month yeerly, and was inſtituted in memorial of trumpetting. What Trumpetting? Verily, there is no Trumpetting recorded in Scripture, whereof this may be accounted a *memorial*; but that of the Angels the firſt day of Creation, whereof *Job* ſpeaketh, *Job* 38. 7. The Sons of God blew their Trumpets when the Foundations of the Earth were laid. This then being the reaſon of that Feaſt, and of as long continuance as the world it ſelf, it would follow, according to his manner of reaſoning, That the Feaſt of Trumpets ſhould be obſerved ſtill; yet no man will think this a good Argument to prove the perpetuity of that Jewiſh Feaſt. And the Reaſon why this his Argument holds not, in regard of days of publick worſhip, is, becauſe of the ſhadowineſs of all days of worſhip, as hath been proved by the Apoſtle in that of the *Coloſſians*.

* *Our Tranſlation reads it, The ſons of God ſhouted for joy. But the Original ſaith, They blew their trumpets.*

Fourthly, His fourth Reaſon (*page* 5.) hath four terms in it, and therefore concludeth not: for it is one thing to ſay, (as the fourth Commandment doth) that the ſeventh day, namely, from *Jehovah*'s Reſt, is to be kept holy; and another thing to ſay (as the Author intends it) the ſeventh day of the week. It is true, That the performance of Holy Duties of publick worſhip, doth neceſſarily require a ſet-day for that purpoſe, becauſe no worſhip can be obſerved, but in time; and no time ſo fit, as that day which God himſelf hath inſtituted; as thoſe (and other) Scriptures alledged by the Author, will *Obſerv.* 4.

will fully prove: but they conclude as ſtrongly for our obſervation of the *Lords day*, upon the *firſt day* of the week, now under the Goſpel, as formerly they did conclude for the obſervation of the Jewiſh Sabbath, under the Law.

As for the Arguments which he brings to prove the fourth Commandment to be Moral, they might well have been ſpared, unleſs perhaps the Author meant to ſuggeſt, that the Obſervers of the *Lords day*, do deny the *morality* of the fourth Command: which is not ſo: for we do conſtantly avouch it, as well as himſelf doth; and he himſelf knoweth it. We alſo profeſs the morality of the ſecond Command, which injoyneth us to worſhip God in ſuch manner as himſelf hath inſtituted: which worſhip under the Pædagogy of *Moſes*, was Sanctuary and Temple-worſhip, conſiſting in Sacrifices, and ſundry Rites and Ceremonies, which are now abrogated and changed under the Goſpel, and other more ſuitable worſhip inſtituted: yet that impaireth not the *morality* of the ſecond Commandment, which now requireth another kinde of worſhip, differing from what it was then. For both theſe Commandments, I mean, the ſecond and the fourth, are purpoſely ſo penned by the wiſdom of God, as yet they leave him at liberty to vary the manner and time of publick worſhip, according to his good will and pleaſure under different Diſpenſations; and yet the Commands themſelves remain perpetually the ſame, as all moral Precepts be.

Obſerv. 5. What the Author means by ſo vaſt a difference in point of old Adminiſtration (*pag.7. Arg.5.*) I do not well underſtand. I read in Scripture of Miniſtration of Condemnation, and Miniſtration of Righteouſneſs, ſpeaking of the difference of Adminiſtrations between the Law and the Goſpel, the Old and New Covenant: but I finde no ſuch diſtinction in Scripture, of Miniſtration of Moral, and Miniſtration of Ceremonial Law; nor can I diſcern the Authors meaning. I confeſs there is a clear diſtinction betwixt the *Moral* and the *Ceremonial Law*; but that proveth little, what the Author would have. He argueth, that becauſe there is a diſtinction between the Moral and the Ceremonial Law, therefore the ſeventh-day-Sabbath, or Sabbath of the ſeventh day of the week, is *moral*. Pray you, what neceſſity of conſequence is there in ſuch reaſoning? Should I have ſaid, there is a diſtinction of *Moral* and *Ceremonial Law*, therefore the Sabbath of the ſeventh day of the week is Ceremonial; he would not have approved the manner of reaſoning: yet

yet the inference had been true, though the consequence be not necessary: but this inference is neither true, nor any necessity why it should follow upon his premises. As for his sixth Argument (to prove the Morality of the fourth Command) taken from the erecting or painting thereof in Parish-Churches, it is most invalid; for what is the painting of the fourth Command in Parish-Churches, amongst the other Commandments, unto the Morality of the same? Had the Painter put an Edict of the Prince or State amongst the ten Commandments; would that have proved the morality of such an Edict? surely no. But if it be said, it argues the Painters Opinion touching the Morality of that Command, because he inserts it amongst the rest, yet that will not necessarily follow. But grant it was his Opinion, or the Opinion of those that set him to work: what's all this to prove the morality of that Commandment, or of any other? will either their painting it on the wall, or their intentions in so doing, prove the same to be moral?

The rest of his Book consists in Objections and Answers: some of which Objections are not rightly stated, nor strongly answered; as the 1,2,3 Objections, *page* 11,12,13,14. which I pass by without Reply, because I would not make mistakes to appear more nor greater then needs must, and I shall only touch upon some passages that are most remarkable.

First, I shall begin with that which the Author alledgeth out of Mr. *Willet* in his Commentary upon the 20th of *Exodus*: 6. *Where*, saith *Willet*, *the observation of the seventh day of the week is simply ceremonial*: to wit, meerly or purely Ceremonial: opposing the word *simple*, unto that which is compound or mix'd. To which the Author replieth, That the word *simple*, may as well be applied to the Objector, as the Objection: wantonly descanting upon the word *simple*, (which we sometimes use in another sense for a *fool*, as you may read, *Prov.*9.4,16.) putting the *fool* upon Mr. *Willet*, and others of the same judgement. Let men of sober and moderate spirits, judge whether this be an Answer sufficient, to call the Objector a *fool*; or the Objection, a foolish Objection. Let them be also Judge whether it be a candid or Christian course, to invert a word which hath a double signification unto the scorn and contempt of their Opponents, especially such as have been faithful servants and witnesses for Christ in their generation. I suppose it may well be said to him, as our Saviour said to his Disciples, upon another occasion, *Ye know not of what spirit ye are.* *Observ.*

Let all therefore that read that Book, *Try the ſpirits whether they be of God*; and judge in their own hearts, whether ſuch expreſſions ſavour not too much of *Iſhmael's* temper. And that I may no more take occaſion to touch upon this ſtring, I ſhall here collect the various expreſſions of the ſame Author, breathing forth ſuch a kinde of diſtemper of ſpirit; wiſhing the Author himſelf to ask his own heart the queſtion, what he meant ſo often to mention the Quakers, coupling them and the Obſervers of the Lord's day, or firſt day of the week, together? as *pag.* 12. *l.* 25. and *pag.* *l.* 14. and elſewhere. Was it not to leave ſome odium upon ſuch as profeſs the *firſt day* of the week, to be our Chriſtian Reſt? If ſo, then conſider whether he be not too blame with his Brethren. Other unſavoury expreſſions I meet with afterwards, wherein he doth not only reflect upon their perſons, (calling them, in a way of ſlighting, *Obſervators of the firſt day of the week*, pag. 29. l. 43.) but vilifying *the day of the Lord* it ſelf, calling it, in a ſlighting way, *a new-made Sabbath* pag. 24. l. 13. and reckoning it amongſt the ſuperſtitious Trumperies of the Romiſh Harlot; and ſaith, *That Saints days are of the ſame linage with the firſt day of the week*, p. 29. l. 43. which comes neer unto blaſphemy. The very naming of theſe things may be ſufficient ground unto any ſober Chriſtian Spirit, to ſuſpect and diligently to examine the matter which is held forth by ſuch unſavoury language. I may truely ſay, That of all the Writings upon that Subject which hitherto I have met with, I have not found ſuch a ſpirit of ſcorn and contumely in them all, as I found in this one ſmall Treatiſe. But I ſhall paſs over theſe uncomfortable paſſages, with this caution to the Reader; not onely to try the Doctrines they read, but the Spirit of the Men that holds them forth, whether they be of God, and accordingly to receive them or reject them.

Obſerv. 7. In the next place I ſhall come to take notice of ſome Scriptures quoted by the Author, paſſing by ſundry Objections and Anſwers, which, with their Graine, may be allowed, as the Objections are ſtated, and yet the main Queſtion remains untouched.

Firſt therefore let me begin with that in *John* 21. 1, 2, 3. alledged, *pag.* 24. and ſhew the Author's miſtake, which will wholly enervate the Author's Anſwer. He ſaith, *The Apoſtles were a fiſhing upon their new-made Sabbath*, as he terms it; and

and, *that Christ on that day shewed them how to cast their nets, and therefore it could be no Sabbath*; saith the Author. I confess, if the Authors Allegation were true, That the day whereon the Lord Jesus then appeared to them, as they were fishing, had been the first day of the week, it might have argued strongly against the observation of that day, as a Sabbath, or day of holy Rest. But the Author is greatly mistaken for want of examining the Text, which doth not once mention a new-made Sabbath, as he calls it, nor the first day of the week. Whereof I thought it necessary to give the Reader warning, lest he should be mistaken through over much credulity, trusting to the Author's bare relation. It was rather on the seventh day of the week, or some other day of work.

Then, to avoid that Scripture, *Act.* 20. 7. which saith, *They met upon the first day of the week to break bread:* the Author tells us, That his judgement leads him to believe, that the day there spoken of, was one of the Sabbaths of seven weeks, or Feast of *Pentecost*; and that the breaking of bread there spoken of, cannot be understood of the mysteryes of Christ in the Supper. But behold how contrary his judgement and belief is unto the Apostles expres words: For, in the *verse* foregoing, the Apostle saith, *We sailed from Philipi after the feast of unleavened bread, and came to Troas in five days; where we abode seven dayes.* All which make but twelve days, whereunto add eight days for the Feast; and it was but twenty days at most after the Passeover; and therefore cannot be meant of *Pentecost*, which was the 50th day after the Passeover, and was but of one days continuance: Wherefore the Author mistakes to think That the first day of the week spoken of, should be the Feast of *Pentecost*; or that it was one of the days of that Feast, which had onely one day. Also, he mistakes in calling that Feast by the name of a Sabbath: for, though they might do no servile work therein, yet it is never stiled by *Moses* or the Apostles, *a Sabbath* as I have formerly shewed. And it is not safe for him, or any other, to give such names unto any of God's holy Days, as the Lord himself hath not given. He might well say, His judgement leads him so to believe; but the *word* leads me to believe otherwise. And however the Author makes no more of breaking of bread (there mentioned) then common eating, yet the *Syriack* reads it thus: *When the Disciples came together to break the Eucharist:* namely the Bread in the *Observ.* 8.

Lord's Supper. Now when the Scripture ſpeaketh of the Lord's Supper, it uſually expreſſeth it by that phraſe of breaking bread: and therefore it will be ſafeſt for us ſo to underſtand that phraſe; unleſs ſome neceſſity require it to be otherwiſe, as in the 11 *verſ.* where it is ſaid, *When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread*, &c. in which place, the Syriack uſeth a word commonly taken for breaking of bread at our uſual repaſt, diſtinguiſhing that breaking of bread from the breaking of the Euchariſt or bread in the Lord's Supper mentioned in the 7 *verſe*. And the conſideration of the time or ſeaſon when this was done, being after midnight, (and by conſequence the ſecond day of the week, as the Author rightly obſerveth) doth neceſſarily infer, that the breaking bread there mentioned, is to be underſtood of common bread, they having celebrated the Lord's Supper before upon the firſt day of the week or the Lord's day, that being one main end of their aſſembling together, as it is ſaid, *v.* 7.

As for that place *Act.* 2. 43. I know there be many would have it to be meant of common breaking of bread, becauſe the word *dayly* is added. But that word *dayly*, doth not neceſſarily inforce ſuch a ſence, as if they broke bread every day in the week, or every day in the yeer: onely it holdeth forth thus much: that every day when the Church aſſembled for publick worſhip, (to wit, every Lord's day or firſt day of the week) they did break bread or celebrate the Supper: to ſhew, that they did not celebrate that Ordinance once onely in the yeer, as the Jews did their Paſſeover; and as the Papiſts do their Eaſter: nor only once a month, as ſome Churches have done; but each firſt day of the week, when they aſſembled for publick worſhip, they celebrated the Supper of the Lord.

And whereas the Author ſuggeſteth, that the Apoſtles in changing the day or time of publick worſhip, ſhould have changed the Morality of the Sabbath, (as he ſpeaketh.) It is a meer miſtake; for the Apoſtles did not, nor do we believe they could change any Moral Precept. We onely ſay, That they changed or removed that which was ſhadowy and Ceremonial, in reſpect of the day or circumſtance of time; and in room thereof, have left unto us a day of Reſt and holy Worſhip, that is not ſhadowy at all.

Obſerv. 9. From the 1 *Cor.* 16. 1, 2, 3. the Author raiſeth an Objection, and maketh an Anſwer thereunto: which Anſwer, comprehendeth mani-

manifold miſtakes. For firſt he diſapproveth our Tranſlation, *upon the firſt day of the week*, and chuſeth to render it, *the firſt of Sabbaths*. Not obſerving, that both the word *Sabbath* in the ſingular number, and *Sabbaths* in the plural number, is put for week or weeks, as you may read if you compare *Lev.*23.15. and *Deut.*16.9. Wherefore he doth not well, to chuſe an obſcure phraſe to darken the ſenſe of the place. Secondly, he would have us believe that the word *Sabbath*, in the ſingular number, is to be underſtood of the ſeventh day of the week; and Sabbaths in the plural number, are to be underſtood of Ceremonial Feaſts. But he is much miſtaken in the true uſe of thoſe words. For as I ſhewed before the firſt day of the 7th month, and the firſt and laſt days of the Feaſt of Tabernacles, and alſo the tenth day of the ſeventh month, are called (in the ſingular number) *a Sabbath*, or Sabbatiſm, *Lev.*23.24,32,39. And once the word Sabbath is put for a week, *Lev.*23.16. compared with *Deut.*16.9. It is true indeed, that the word *Sabbath* is generally put for the ſeventh day of the Weeks Reſt; becauſe that day is more frequent then any of the reſt, and oftener ſpoken of in Scripture: yet it doth not therefore follow, that when the word is pronounced in the ſingular number, it muſt always be ſo underſtood, as I ſhewed before.

Again, the Author doth as much miſtake the word *Sabbaths*, in the plural number: for he ſaith, it is to be underſtood of Ceremonial Feaſts, and for proof thereof, quoteth *Lev.*25.9. and 26.34.35. which ſpeak not of days of Feaſt, but yeers of Reſt unto the Land, and releaſe unto Servants; which Sabbatical yeers, are in thoſe Scriptures called *Sabbaths*. And to ſay the very truth, the word *Sabbaths*, is for the moſt part (in Scripture) meant of the dayes of Reſt upon the ſeventh day of the week, as is plain by *Lev.* 23.38. *Neh.*10.33. *Lev.*19.4,30. and in many other places in *Moſes* and the Prophets: onely once you read it put for weeks, *Lev.*23.15. compared with *Deut.*16.9. and five times the word *Sabbaths* in the plural number is uſed for Sabbatical yeers, *Lev.* 25.8. and 26.34.35.43. 2 *Chro.*36.21. But it is never to be underſtood of ſolemn Feaſts, as he would have it.

Again, He ſaith, The word *Sabbathon*, 1 *Cor.*16.3. (which we render, *the firſt day of the week*) is to be underſtood of thoſe Ceremonial Feaſts. As if the Apoſtle ſhould have ſaid, *Upon the firſt day of the feaſts, let every one of you lay aſide*, &c. But this would be inconſiſtent both with Scripture phraſe, and with the

Apoſtles

Apoſtles Doctrine and Practice alſo. For as I obſerved before, the word *Sabbaths*, in the plural number, is never pronounced of Feaſts, by the Pen-men of holy writ. Yet ſuppoſe it were, what reaſon can we imagine, ſhould move the Apoſtle to expreſs himſelf in a dark, obſcure and ambiguous word, when another word would have put the matter out of all controverſie, had he but ſaid, *upon the firſt day of the Feaſts*: which, the Author ſaith, was his meaning: and ſaith, that the word *Sabbathon*, is ſo to be underſtood in that place. Beſides, how unlikely is it, that the Apoſtle would ſtint and limit their collections for the poor Saints unto one day of the Feaſts? may we not rather think, that the Apoſtles ſcope was to ſtir up the Brethren unto a weekly contribution, when their hearts had been well warmed by the Miniſtery of the word, and were more enlarged to communicate to their fellow-brethren? This were more likely to accompliſh the Apoſtles end, as it is written, *That there be no gatherings when I come.*

Moreover, this is moſt certain, that the Apoſtles never taught any of the Gentile-Churches to obſerve Jewiſh Feſtivals, and days of Worſhip; but on the contrary, he preacheth the abolition of them, as I ſhewed from that of the *Coleſſians*. And how ſhould we then imagine, that he ever intended to give Order for collections to be made upon thoſe days, which he ſo expreſly forbiddeth them to obſerve, *Col.* 2. 16.

Thus you ſee, how many errors the Author runneth into at once, that he might evade the force of an Argument grounded upon that Scripture, which plainly proveth, that the Churches meetings to celebrate publick worſhip, and to do other Church-acts, were upon the *firſt day of the week.*

As for his Argument drawn from comparing, *Deut.* 16. 10, 11. with 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. it hath no weight at all with it, if the words be duly weighed: for that in *Deuteronomy* ſpeaketh of giving a Tribute of a Free-will Offering, *as the Lord hath bleſſed them*; or, *according to which thy God may bleſs thee*: and it is ſpoken of the Feaſt of Pentecoſt when they reaped their corn. The words in the *Corinthians* are, by our Tranſlators, rendred. *as God hath bleſſed him*: others read them, *as he would be bleſſed or proſpered of God.* And ſo reading the words, they have a neer affinity with the words of *Moſes*, ſaying, that they differ in the time. The one was to be done once in the yeer, at the Feaſt of Pentecoſt; and the other ever firſt day of the week. Yet I ſhould rather chuſe to

read

read the words thus: *Let every one lay by him in ſtore, which may be bleſſed of God*; or, *may have a proſperous conveyance*, given by God according to the deſire of their hearts, for releif of the poor Saints at *Jeruſalem*: for when any thing according to the purpoſe, intention or deſire of our hearts, is bleſſed of God, unto the ends we aimed at, this is, εὐοδῶται. And this I conceive was the Apoſtles meaning in that phraſe, to ſtrengthen their Faith in aſſurance, that what they did with free hearts contribute, God would take care for the ſafety of its conveyance to the relief of their brethren. Now if you read the words thus: then they hold forth a quite other matter to that which *Moſes* ſaith. But read the words as you pleaſe, yea, ſo as may moſt favour the Author's ſcope; nay ſuppoſe the word to be one and the ſame: yet it will not follow from the indentity of words, that *Paul* and *Moſes* muſt needs ſpeak of the ſame time. It is not the *ſameneſs* of the thing done, or ſameneſs of the manner of doing, that doth infer the *ſameneſe* or indentity of time; becauſe the ſame duty may be performed in the ſame manner, at ſeveral ſeaſons. He might as well reaſon from reſſemblance and likeneſs, that *Hannah* and *Elizabeth*, two ſiſters, that reſemble each other in feature, in ſtature, in ſpeech and deportment, *&c.* are one and the ſame individual perſon, becauſe of their likeneſs one to the other. And though the Author of that Treatiſe ſay it is meant of Pentecoſt, the Jewiſh Feaſt: yet you ſee that that cannot be, becauſe it was antiquated to the Jews, and utterly forbidden the Gentile-Chriſtians.

All which conſidered it will appear, That the Authors Anſwer doth not in the leaſt infringe the Argument drawn from that Scripture, to prove the obſervation of our Reſt upon the firſt day of the week. For if the Apoſtle did enjoyn the Churches to convene upon that day: and being met together, they did celebrate the Supper, and communicate to the neceſſities of the Saints (which are proper and peculiar acts of Church-power and order) and if Chriſt himſelf did break bread and bleſs it, and gave it the Diſciples upon that day, and by theſe actions they diſcerned him to be the Lord *, then it argueth ſtrongly, that the firſt day of the week was ſet apart not onely by the Apoſtles, but by our Lord Jeſus himſelf, for duties of publick worſhip.

* Lu. 24. 30 *which words there uſed, are the very ſame that he uſed in his inſtitution of the ſupper. And therefore I doubt not, but he did by that act, commemorate his death, & ſo made himſelf known to theſe two Diſciples.*

The Author ſaith, That by the Lord's day, *Rev* 1. 10. is not meant the firſt day of the week, but the ſeventh day; becauſe the ſeventh day is called the Sabbath *of the Lord thy God*, Exod. 20. 10. *Obſerv.* 10.

10. But to omit what I ſaid before, that it is not written the ſeventh day of the week, &c. yet the variation of the phraſe is obſervable: for *Moſes* doth not call the ſeventh day of the week the *Lords day*, or day of the Lord, (which phraſe is uſual amongſt the Prophets, as *Iſa.* 13.6.) Neither doth *John* ſay, I was in the Spirit upon the Sabbath day, or upon the ſeventh day of the week; but he ſaith, *I was in the ſpirit on the Lords day.* Now had the Spirit which breathed both in *Moſes* and *John* intended the ſame thing in both places, we may well conceive he would have uſed the ſame phraſe of ſpeech. And if we will give any reſpect to the Syriack Tranſlation, (which ſeems to be made in the firſt Century, whilſt ſome of the Apoſtles lived) you ſhall finde that where the Greek doth read it, the *Lords ſupper*, 2 Cor. 11.21. the Syriack renders it the *Lords day*; as being the day whereon they were wont to celebrate the Supper; which was upon the firſt day of the week, as was ſhewed before.

And if any ſhall ask me what reaſon might move the Apoſtle to call the firſt day of the week the Lords day:

I anſwer: firſt, It may be ſo called by the Apoſtle, to ſhew that that day was inſtituted by himſelf in room of the Sabbath upon the ſeventh day of the week: for he was Lord of the Sabbath, and had power to inſtitute, abrogate, and diſpence with the Reſt; as he proves by ſeveral inſtances, and by the preſent caſe of his Diſciples; and therefore he had power to abrogate and alter: for, *cujus eſt inſtituere, ejus eſt deſtituere.*

Secondly, it may be called *his day* in ſpecial manner, becauſe he choſe that day, whereon to *break bread* with his Diſciples after his Reſurrection; ſecretly inſtructing them thereby, that he had ſet it apart for ſuch duties of publick worſhip.

Thirdly, it may be called the Lords day, becauſe it was the day whereon he was conceived and born, the day whereon he was baptized; and afterward humbled for the firſt *Adam*'s ſins: it was alſo the day on which he roſe again and brake bread with his Diſciples, as I have ſaid: and the day whereon he ſate down at his Fathers right hand, and poured forth his Spirit. In all which reſpects the Apoſtle might well call it the LORD's DAY. Wherefore the ſlight Anſwer wherewith the Author thinks to remove the force of this Text, doth not at all ſatisfie, nor in the leaſt detract from the truth held forth; namely, that the firſt day of the week, is, by way of excellency, called the *Lords day.* And had he conſidered

ſidered well before he wrote, what the meaning of Lordſhip over the Sabbath means, I ſuppoſe he would not ſo eaſily have thought to blow away the argument grounded upon this Text.

Again in anſwer to that Text, *Heb.* 4. 10. he is pleaſed to ſay, That that Scripture onely comprehends a parallel betwixt the temporal and eternal *Canaan*. But if the matter be well weighed, I ſuppoſe we ſhall finde the Apoſtles ſcope to be more then ſo. For you obſerve, That the Apoſtle having to deal with the Jews, he labors by manifold arguments throughout that Epiſtle to take them off from reſting upon *Moſes*, and all *Moſaical* Rites and Worſhip; and ſo leads them to Chriſt, of whom *Moſes* propheſied, and to whom *Moſes* was but a ſervant; that from him they might take all their directions for Worſhip, both as to the Worſhip it ſelf, and alſo the time and manner thereof: aſſuring them that he was as faithful as they could poſſibly apprehend *Moſes* to be. And becauſe no Worſhip can be performed without a time limited for that purpoſe; and Chriſtians now were not to obſerve the ſame days of Worſhip, as the Fathers of old did; the Apoſtle gives them a Reaſon of the ſame, in one principal day of Worſhip; namely, the Sabbath: which notwithſtanding doth not in the leaſt infringe the Morality of the fourth Commandment. For he which is entred into his *Reſt*, to wit, Jeſus the Mediator of the New Teſtament, hath alſo ceaſed from his own works, as God did from his; and therefore our obſervation of the firſt day in the week, doth not at all hinder the Morality of the Command. For whilſt the Ground and Reaſon of our *Reſt*, is the ſame it was before, (namely, *Jehovah*'s Reſt from his works) the Morality of the Precept is not wronged: but the Ground of our Chriſtian *Reſt* is the ſame: therefore. Now that the ground of our *Reſt* is the ſame which the fourth Commandment requires, he proveth, becauſe ſaith he, Jeſus *that is entred into his Reſt, he alſo hath ceaſed from his own works as God did from his.* As if he ſhould have ſaid, You Jews keep a *Reſt* upon the *ſeventh day*, becauſe God reſted as that day from his works of Creation: we Chriſtians celebrate the firſt day of the week, becauſe on that day Chriſt reſted from his work of Redemption, which is as great and glorious a work, and of as great good, and more, to us, then the work of Creation: and the Commandment bindes us as firmly to the later, as it did you unto the former. *Obſerv.* 11.

Queſt. If then the queſtion be, *When did Chriſt ceaſe from his works?*

Answ. I answer: first, negatively, That this cessation is not to be understood of the time of his lying in the Grave; for that was but a cessation from external actions, as upon that day whereof the 7th day Sabbath was a shadow, and therefore was abolished, when Christ had actually fulfilled it. This his lying in the Grave was a part of his work, and was indeed the last and lowest degree of his humiliation: therefore his work of Redemption was not finished till he rose again.

Secondly, I answer, That Christ rested from his works upon that day whereon he rose again, and sate down at his Father's right-hand. His Resurrection was the beginning (as I may say) of his *Rest*; and the other, the completing of the same; which is fitly set forth by his posture of sitting, a proper Embleme of *Rest*. And if we would rightly understand, when Christ entred into his *Rest*, or ceased from his works; let us consider what is meant by God's works, and his ceasing; and what is meant by Christ's works, and his ceasing from his own works. Doth not Christ say, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work?* How then is it said, God ceased from his works? *Answ.* There be works of Creation, works of Providence, and works of Redemption. Now God ceased from works of Creation upon the seventh day of the week. 2. There be works of Providence, and from them there is no intermission; but the Father and Son both are at work still. 3. There are works of Redemption, which being accomplished, Christ resteth from them: and his cessation from those works, is the ground of our *Rest*, and of our observance of the *Lords day*, grounded upon the fourth Commandment.

Observ. 12. In the last plast place, he makes a seeming (and in my judgement, a weak) answer to that place of Scripture, *Col.* 2. 16, 17. which place, rightly understood, doth fully abrogate the seventh day of the week Sabbath, and all other Ceremonial days of worship, as I have shewed before. All which (like shadows) did flee away at Christ's death, as *Solomon* propheſied of them, *Cant.* 2. 17. and 4. 6. Onely I think it necessary to add a few words for further clearing of that Text: which is the most pregnant place to prove the abrogation of all *Mosaical* worship and days of worship. And because the Author in answering that Scripture, strangely jumbleth three Scriptures together, (namely, *Gal.* 5. 1. *Eph.* 2, 15. *Col.* 2. 14.) saying, *That in the seventh-day-sabbath, there is nothing* a *contrary to us Gentiles, nor any* b *yoke of bondage, or* c *enmity, as that*

a *Col.* 2. 14.
b *Gal.* 5. 1.
c *Eph.* 3. 16.

that it needed to be ſlain, or d *taken out of the way*: The confuſion of his Anſwer, argueth the confuſion of his ſpirit in his Reply. I ſhall therefore briefly unfold the words of theſe ſeveral Texts, and by that it will the better appear to the Reader, how little he hath anſwered to the queſtion. The firſt word *blotting out*, Col. 2. 14. doth ſignifie ſuch a kinde of obliteration, as leaveth no tittle or foot-ſtep of the thing remaining: ſee *Zanchy* upon this Text. It is a metaphorical ſpeech taken from accountants; which when a debt was paid, were wont to blot it quite out, that it might not be charged upon the debtor any more. *The hand-writing of ordinances*, are all Ceremonial Inſtitutions. The word κατ' ἡμῶν, *againſt us*, as our Tranſlation reads it, doth alſo ſignifie, *according to us*; and is ſo tranſlated *e*, and ſo I conceive it ought to be rendered in this place. So then the meaning of the Apoſtle, I conceive to be this, *That the hand-writing of ordinances*, or *Moſaical* Rites and inſtitutions, which is *according to us*, ſuited to the Jewiſh Pædagogy and framed according to the ſtate of that people, *is blotted out*, and quite obliterated by Chriſt: amongſt which Ordinances, he reckoneth all the Jewiſh Sabbaths, as a part. But afterwards, when he ſaith, * *which was contrary to us*; it implies, That thoſe *Moſaical* inſtitutions, however they were ſuited unto their ſtate, yet they were ſecretly againſt them, and adverſaries to them, as the word imports. They were ſecretly againſt the Jews, that truſted to make up their defect of obedience to the Moral Law, by obſervation of ſuch Ceremonies; and ſo whilſt they looked for *f* juſtification thereby, they fell ſhort of the righteouſneſs which is by faith: they were alſo againſt the Gentiles, becauſe they ſtood as a wall of partition betwixt the *g* Jews and them, until Chriſt removed them away, and brake down this wall of partition. This wall of partition was an occaſion of *h* enmity between Jews and Gentiles. And was it not then needful that theſe ſhould be ſlain as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh? was there not need to remove theſe out of the way; nailing them to his croſs? So then, as the Jews nailed Chriſt upon the croſs, and ſlew him; even ſo theſe ceremonies and ſhadows are by Chriſt nailed to his croſs, and ſlain.

d *Col.* 2. 14.

e *Rom.* 9. 11.

* Ὁ ἦν ὑπεναντίον.

f *Rom.* 9. 31, 32.

g *Eph.* 2. 14

h *Eph.* 2. 16.

And thus you ſee the nulling and abolition of all types and ſhadows, the time when, and the means whereby it was effected, to wit, the death of Chriſt upon the croſs. From whence we may conclude, That all Ceremonies and ſhadows of Chriſt, without exception, were againſt the Jews, both as they were a yoke of bon-

dage; and as they became an occasion of stumbling to the carnal Jews, who did expect justification thereby; they also were against the Gentiles, because they stood as a partition-wall; and therefore needful they should be done away.

I believe the Author would let all shadows go, saving this of the *Sabbath upon the seventh day of the week*, which he would have to escape out of the overthrow. He is as tender of this, as *Lot* was of *Zoar*, or *Jonah* of his Gourd. I know it will be hard to convince by Arguments, except the Spirit, whose Office it is to convince, do undertake the work, and breath in poor weak instruments. But if once the Spirit do come, and open all these Scriptures, and clear up to our hearts what these shadows be, and how Feasts, New Moons and Sabbaths, even all of them, are shadows, or make up one entire shadow of Christ to come; then will carnal Reason vanish, and all our former darkness, which misled us, vanish as dew before the Sun: and then we shall plainly see, and not till then, that we cannot retain any part or parcel of these Legal Constitutions; but we do by consequence deny, that Christ the substance is come.

Briefly therefore to conclude, I shall winde up all with a word or two of Advertisement: first, to the Author of that Treatise, and all others that shall write Books, to weigh their words, and examine the Scriptures, and let your Language be the Language of *Canaan*, and not of *Ashdod*; or as the Apostle saith, *Let your speech* (and writing) *alway be with grace, seasoned with salt*, Col. 4. 6. Secondly, let me speak two words to such as are Readers of other mens writings: 1. weigh the matter and the words also, in the ballance of the Sanctuary: search the Scriptures, whether things be so, ere you give credit to every bold assertion. 2. Try (not onely the Doctrines and Positions, but also) the Spirit that breathes therein, 1 *John* 4. 1. and if you finde a Spirit of scorn and blasphemy, or self, take heed of it; and the Lord give you understanding in all things.

Having

HAving met with another large Treatiſe, without the Author's name, intituled, *The Morality of the fourth Commandment*: divided into ſeven Chapters, pleading for the ſeventh-day-Sabbath; and perceiving that ſome tender ſpirits are too much taken with it, and it may be the more for the Author's ſake, who is a godly man: I thought good, at the requeſt of a Brother, to ſpeak ſomething briefly to the ſeveral Chapters, the Arguments and Scriptures therein alledged, to ſhew how little weight there is in all of them, (together conſidered) to prove that the ſeventh-day-Sabbath, (obſerved by the Saints before our Lord Jeſus reſurrection) is binding to us Chriſtians. In handling whereof, I ſhall deal candidly and tenderly, as I may; concealing the Authors name. Yet to avoid tediouſneſs, I muſt briefly ſum up the chapters, and take only the marrow or ſubſtance of them, ſuch as ſeem to carry any ſhew of Argument with them: and that I may follow the Authors method I ſhall diſtribute my anſwer into ſeven parts, according to his ſeven Chapters.

To the firſt Chapter.

The ſubſtance of the firſt Chapter, is, That the World is credulous of Error, and blinde as to Truth; and that long Cuſtom, and old Tradition, ſtrengthened with Wit and Learning, prevaileth to give credit to Error; and that the brighteſt Star in the Church, will become dark if God withhold his Light; and that God hath deſigned ſome diſtinguiſhing Truth to every Age; and that the multitude will ſooner take up ſtones to throw at the Truth, then Scriptures to examine it by, *&c.*

Unto all which I ſay, 'Tis true: But alas! what is this to prove the ſeventh-day-Sabbath? may not Papiſts, Arminians, *&c.* ſay as much for ſundry of their Opinions? yea, doth it not rather make againſt the ſeventh-day-Sabbath, to ſay, That God hath deſigned ſome diſtinguiſhing Truth to every Age? is it not plain, That one diſtinguiſhing Truth of the Saints before Chriſt, was their Reſt upon the 7th day, to wit, that day on which the Creator reſted from his works of Creation? And ſince Chriſt's Reſurrection, doth not this diſtinguiſh the Chriſtians or new Saints from thoſe old Saints, that they keep their *Reſt* upon the firſt day of the week, on which our Lord

Lord Jesus did rise, and *rest* from his works of *Redemption*? But methinks the Author's words, *pag.* 7. may be an Answer sufficient to that whole Chapter. For (saith he) the whole stream of the practice of the Godly, is generally against this Opinion, which he holdeth forth: and if so, it would be a Christians wisdom, to take heed how he runs contrary to the whole stream of Godly men; for such *God doth lead in pathes of righteousness for his names sake.* As for his Exhortation to renounce our own parts and wisdom, and to depend upon the Father of light, *&c.* it is good, and wholesome, and may very fitly be recommended to himself, and others of his judgement.

Thus much I thought necessary to say unto his first Chapter, to shew the Reader, how useless it is, to make good his Position, and so proceed to the next.

To the second Chapter.

In this Chapter the Author argues for the seventh-day-Sabbath upon this Ground, because it is generally counted Jewish, which (saith he) is a *nickname.* Had he said a *distinguishing* name, it had been more proper; for so the Old Testament-*Saints* are called *Jews*, and New Testament-*Saints* are called *Christians.* And these are not nick-names; but proper and distinguishing names. Yet should we argue for our *Lords day* upon the same ground, because himself, and those of his judgement call it *Antichristian*, (which is indeed a *nick-name*, or worse) the Author would esteem it a weak kinde of reasoning; and well might he so do.

Then he produceth another Argument for the seventh-day-Sabbath, from the number of *seven*, which, he saith, comes of a root that signifieth *fulness.* Suppose the root did signifie *fulness*, what would that prove as to the morality of the day? But the Author in this doth much mistake himself; for the word שבע, which signifieth *seven*, comes of נשבע, *to swear*: or rather, it self is the root thereof. The root that signifieth *fulness*, is שבע, and written with *Sin*, not with *Shin*; and by the Grammarians it is made a distinct root. Therefore the Author should have been better advised, ere he had put an occasion of stumbling, before such as are ignorant of that Tongue, or discovered his own weakness in publishing such a thing without examination. *Job* counteth it a fault in his friends, that they spake either perversly or fraudulently for God, *Job* 13.7. As-

Afterwards he proceedeth to argue for the ſeventh day, from the inſtitution thereof in Paradiſe; from the Father's Reſt, and from the Saints Reſt in Heaven, and from Chriſt's reſting in the Grave on that day: as alſo, becauſe the Tables were put into the Ark, therefore the ſeventh day is moral and perpetual.

To which fragments, I anſwer: Firſt, That the inſtitution of the ſeventh day in Paradiſe, doth not prove it moral. For, by the ſame Reaſon, we might argue that the Tree of Life, and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, (which were Sacraments inſtituted in Paradiſe) were moral and perpetual. Indeed the Fathers *reſting* on the ſeventh day from works of Creation, was Ground enough for man to reſt from his labour, upon that day, until the Redeemer (who was Lord of the *Sabbath*, as well as his Father, and, as Lord, had power to alter and abrogate, as well as inſtitute:) I ſay, until the Redeemer had inſtituted another day, in memorial of his own reſting from works of Redemption, as his Father had done from his proper works of Creation. Now the day of Chriſt's reſting from his proper works of Redemption, was not on the ſeventh day of the week, as the Author would make us believe; but upon the firſt day of the week. For, though he lay in the Grave upon the ſeventh day, and reſted from all actions of life, as upon that day; yet his very lying in the Grave, was the laſt and loweſt degree of his humiliation, and part of his work of Redemption. For, if Chriſt be not raiſed, our Faith is vain, and we are yet in our ſins, 1 *Cor.* 15. 17. wherefore his redeeming work ended not till he roſe from the Dead, and then did his Reſt begin, and not before. His Riſing was the beginning of his Reſt, and his ſitting down at his Father's right-hand, was the compleating (as I may ſay) of his Reſt: and both the one and the other, was upon the firſt day of the week, which we Chriſtians do celebrate as a *Reſt*, in obedience to the fourth Commandment.

As touching the Saints Reſt in Heaven, let the Reader take notice, That the Scripture nowhere ſaith, That they do reſt upon the ſeventh day of the week, or obſerve that day above any other day: nor is there any diſtinction of days or nights there. And as for the putting the Tables in the Ark, it yields no demonſtrative argument for the morality of the ſeventh day, nor yet for any of the Commandments. The placing the fourth Commandment in the Tables, rather argues it to be moral, then the placing of the Tables in

the

in the Ark. For by that argument, Manna and *Aaron's* Rod might be counted moral and perpetual, (which were improper) for they also were put in the Ark, yet they were not moral nor perpetual, but they are done away.

His argument also for the seventh days morality from the Prophets mentioning the *Sabbath* amongst other things moral, (*Isai.* 58. and 56. *Ezek.* 20, and 22.) is of as little force as the former. For by the same reason, burnt *offerings*, and legal *sacrifices*; yea, the *Temple* it self might be counted moral and perpetual, because they are mentioned in the same place amongst things that are moral. But such kinde of reasoning the Author himself would disallow.

Further, the Author reasons from the name Sabbatism, שבתון, *Exod.* 16. 23. (which phrase is also used, *Heb.* 4. 9.) that the seventh-day-Sabbath is moral: but if that argument were good, it would prove the tenth day of the seventh month, or the day of their yeerly Fast to be moral; for it is called by the same name, a Sabbatism, שבתון, *Lev.* 16. 31. and 23. 31. And so also the Feast of Tabernacles, or Nativity of our Lord, and the Feast of Trumpets, or the day of his Conception; for they also are called, שבתון, Sabbatisms, *Lev.* 23. 24, 29. though our Translation renders it *a Sabbath*: so also is the 7th day yeer called, *a Sabbatism*, Lev. 25. 5, 6. Yet I hope the Author will not say, that any of these are moral. And as for *Romes* calling the seventh *dies Sabbati*; it hath no more weight in it to prove the morality of the seventh day, then it would to prove the morality of the first day, or our Lords day, because they call it *dies Dominicus*.

Thus have I briefly touched the several arguments couched by the Author in his second Chapter, and shewed the invalidity of them to evince the truth of his assertion.

To the third Chapter.

In the third Chapter he proceeds to New Testament-proofs, as he says. And first he enquires where the seventh-day-Sabbath, (or Jewish Sabbath) was abrogated?

To which I answer, That it is called a *Shadow*, and abrogated, *Col.* 2. as all other days of legal worship were, namely, *New Moons*, *Feasts*, or holy days: for though the Author would perswade us, That the Apostle in that place keeps off from the least reflexion

flexion upon the *seventh day Sabbath*, as a perishing figure (which it's likely he feared, an unbyassed Reader would be apt so to interpret the Text;) yet with his leave let me say, That the *seventh day Sabbath* is as much, if not more especially intended by the Apostle in that place. For so the word there used in the plural number, *Sabbaths*, doth imply. And I finde no other days or time called *Sabbaths*, which are distinguished either in Old Testament or New, from New Moons or Feasts, saving the *seventh day Sabbath*, the yeerly Fast, and the seventh Yeer. And therefore if any Sabbath was intended above another to be abolished, it was the *seventh day Sabbath*, which was the most usual day of Jewish worship. But the truth is, all days or times of *rest*, wherein Legal Worship was performed, was by the Apostle made null and void, and by consequence, the Legal Worship it self. Yea, the seventh Yeer, which was not a stated time for Worship, but onely a shadow of something touching Christ to come, was by the same Text abrogated.

I know, That such as reason for the *seventh day Sabbath*, do say, That by *Sabbaths* is meant the days of the Feasts, *&c.*

But to that I answer, That such a gloss would confound *New Moons*, *Feasts*, and *Sabbaths* together, which the Prophets and Apostles have ever reckoned distinct. And should that be the meaning, the word (*Sabbaths*) would be superfluous, had it been comprehended in the New Moons, and Feasts mentioned before.

Secondly, I say, That besides the seventh day Sabbath the yeerly Fast, and the seventh Yeer, I finde not any day or time called a *Sabbath*, either by *Moses*, or the Prophets, or Apostles; and therefore we have reason to reject such a private interpretation of the word.

Now whereas the Author mentions that in *Luke* 23.56. where it is said, That they rested on the *Sabbath*, according to the Commandment.

I answer, That those words do not infer a perpetuity of the day, but onely prove their conscientious observance of the seventh day Sabbath, according to the Commandment. For so it was meet and necessary, until our Lord Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath had fulfilled that shadow, by his lying in the Grave, and till by his rising out of the Grave, and resting from his works of Redemption, he had instituted another day of *rest*, in memorial of his *rest*,

distinct from the day of the Creators *rest*, as the Apostle speaks, *Heb.*4.8. Had the day of his *rest*, & the Creators day, been one and the same; what need the Apostle say it was *another day*? And let me commend this to the Readers consideration, that though the Scripture takes notice of the Disciples resting according to the Commandment, immediately before the Resurrection; yet never do they speak of resting, nor of resting according to the Commandment (as upon that day) after the Resurrection. As for the Text alledged, *Act.* 13.43,44. it onely proves, that *Paul* preached on the Jewish Sabbath, and he gives the reason of that practice, because the people were then congregated. This was no gross temporizing, as the Author calls it: for had they not met together, how could he have preached to them? and had they met any other day of the week, it would have been either in season or out of season, and very lawful for him to have preached the Word. And whereas he alledgeth our Saviour's preaching on that seventh day Sabbath, I acknowledge that Christ so did; yea, he did it in obedience to the Commandment, as the day of the Lord's *rest*: for at that time the seventh day was not abolished, but stood in force, until himself had fulfilled it, and so abrogated that shadow, and till he, as Lord of the Sabbath, had instituted another *rest*.

Further, the Author proceedeth to alledge, *Act.* 2. for proof of his assertion, and saith, it was upon the seventh day of the week that the Spirit was poured forth, the Apostles preached, and three thousand were converted, added to the Church, and baptized: he might also have added, breaking of bread, or the Supper, mentioned, *vers.*24. And he may well call these actions *signal characters* of our *Christian Sabbath* or *Rest*. But upon what day of the week were all these things done? He saith, upon the seventh day the week: but if we duly weigh the words, it will appear plainly, that these things were done upon the first day of the week, or the *Lords day*. The words of the Text run thus: *When the day of Pentecost was fully come*, (fulfilled or completed, as the word signifieth) *then were they with one accord*, &c. and then was the Spirit poured forth, *&c.* It is very true, as the Author observes, that the true day of Pentecost, according to the Law, (which was observed by the Apostles) fell out that yeer upon the seventh day of the week, or Jewish Sabbath. But the season when the Spirit was poured forth, was, when that day was compleated and fulfilled, and the first day of the week begun. So that the day of Pentecost

having

having been duely obſerved by the Apoſtles, who waited for the promiſe of the Father, and had ſpent the day in ſeeking God for it; in the very cloſure of that day, juſt as the firſt day of the week begun, Chriſt ſent forth the Spirit in that extraordinary manner; which being noiſed about the City that evening, it ſeems the people of all Languages convened the next morning betimes, to be ſatisfied about it: for it was about the third hour of the day, (or as we ſay, nine a clock in the morning) when *Peter* began his Apology. Thus have I gained one New Teſtament-argument from the Author, to prove the firſt day of the week to be *characterized* above all other days of the week as the day which Chriſt hath choſen in a peculiar manner, to diſpence his word, to pour out his Spirit and ſpiritual gifts; and for his people (being congregated in holy fellowſhip) to diſpence both *baptiſm*, and the *ſupper*. Theſe things conſidered, I commend it to our diſſenting brethrens conſideration, what day can be ſo fitly called *the Lords day*, by way of excellency, as this day which he hath ſo ſignally deſigned unto ſuch ſpiritual ends? And that the Reader may be more fully ſatisfied, that all theſe things were done upon the firſt day of the week, let me expreſs a little further the emphaſis of the word συμπληροῦσθαι, which is a compound word, and ſignifieth to *fill up* and *together*. For by the way you may note, that as the ſuperſtitious Jews obſerved their Paſſeover, that yeer, the day after the true day of Paſſeover kept by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; ſo alſo did they keep their Pentecoſt, the day after the Apoſtles kept the true Pentecoſt. So then the full meaning of that word συμπληροῦσθαι, ſeems to me to be thus much. In the congreſs of theſe two days, when the true day was fully come, and expiring; and the day obſerved by the Jews (at that time) began, then were they met together, *&c.* And this I take to be imported in that phraſe: ſhewing unto us the very nick of time, when Jeſus, being aſcended, and ſet down at his Fathers right-hand, and having received of the Father the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt, he ſhed it forth, *Act.* 2. 33, 34.

A little after, the Author nameth St. *Auguſtine*, St. *Luke*, St. *Peter* &c. which I only mention as a warning to Saints, that they follow not the example of any, though godly, in taking up ſuch ſtiles from Antichriſts ordination, to attribute them to thoſe that are at reſt, except they can finde a Scripture-warrant for it. But I paſs that by.

The place alledged by him, *Act.* 2. 12. it only proves the length

of a journey practised by the Saints upon the day of *rest*; it neither proves the morality of the seventh day, or any other, directly. And whereas he saith, the Apostle discourseth only of the six days, *Rom.* 14.5,6. Let the Reader take notice, that there is not any such word in the Text, as *six days*: it rather seems to be spoken of *Mosaical holy days*, which at that time were yet retained by the Jews, who would not be perswaded of their abrogation.

The Text which the Author quotes (*Joh.* 19.20.) doth not say, as the Author of that book saith, That the work of *redemption* was finished when Jesus was on the cross; nor indeed was it finished when he spake those words, *It is finished*. For, as then, he was not dead, nor laid in his grave; both which were parts of that work: that therefore which he saith *is finished*, is, that now he had offered up himself to the death, even that curst death of the cross, which was the last act he had to do whilst he was alive. As for his *resting* in the grave, I shewed before, that that was part of the work of redemption; and that his resting from that, which properly was the Redeemers work, was his rising out of the grave upon the first day of the week. Wherefore I shall conclude my answer to that third Chapter, with this Position: That since Christ (first) rested from his redeeming works upon the first day of the week, and afterwards the Disciples observed the same; it is most safe for us to keep that day for a day of holy rest.

To the fourth Chapter.

The fourth Chapter is mostly spent in arguments against the first day of the week: for, saith he, Christs appearing to his Disciples on that day, *Joh.* 20. the collections made that day for the poor Saints, 1 *Cor.* 16. the title which some give it, *The Lords day*; and *Paul's* breaking of bread, *Act.* 20. are but examples; they are not commands, nor do they carry the force of a command or institution.

I answer, They are not expres commands indeed, yet they are equivalent to a command, and of the like force: for it is written, *Be followers of God as dear children*, Eph. 5.1. and again, *Be followers of me, as I also am of Christ*, 1 Cor. 11.1. But to stoop to the weakness of these brethren, I would wave the arguments drawn from Christs example, or the Churches practise, and close with them in search after a word of institution. And let all such brethren understand, that we who hold the first day of the week, have a firm word

of

of institution for our practice, to wit, the fourth Commandment. For that Commandment, rightly interpreted, bindes us not absolutely (*& in terminis*) to an observation of the seventh day of the week, as our dissenting brethren urge it; but unto the *seventh day*, counting from Jehovah's rest, as I shewed before in the former Treatise. So that had Jehovah rested upon the seventh day, or first day; or any other day of the week, from that which was his proper work; the fourth Command would binde us, to count from thence six days, and to rest upon the *seventh day* from that rest of Jehovah. Now there being but two days on which Jehovah rested from his proper work, namely, the *seventh*, wherein the Creator rested; and the *first day* of the week wherein the Redeemer rested; the fourth Commandment (by the wisdom of Christ) is so penned, that it bindes all the New Testament-Saints, since his Resurrection, as firmly to observe the *first day* of the week holy, as it did the Saints of the Old Testament unto the *seventh day*.

His argument grounded upon a miss-application of *John* 14.2. taken from the unlikelihood, that Christ would have concealed it from his Apostles, if he had intended the first day should be observed as a rest; it is invalid, and might be retorted upon himself. For by the same reason it may be said, that if Christ had intended the seventh day should be the day of New Testament-worship, Christ would have told them. The next Scripture urged by the Author, is somewhat wronged by him: for it is not said, *Joh.*15.14,15. he concealed nothing from them; but, *all things I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you*: which yet must be warily interpreted because he had not yet shewed them, what Officers he meant to have in his Churches, and many other things concerning his Kingdom, which were reserved till after his Resurrection, to be revealed, *Act.*1.3.

Another argument he brings against the first day of the week because Christ appeared to his Disciples as they were fishing; therefore neither did the Apostles keep it as a Sabbath, nor did Christ so esteem it. But for answer to that let it be considered, that that Scripture, *Joh.* 21. doth not at all mention the day of the week. It might as well be imagined, to be the seventh day, or any other day of the week, as the first day of the week: therefore I pass it by as an argument that hath no footing in the Text. As for the story fetched out of the Popish Legend, it is not worthy an answer, nor fit to be brought in, in this case.

Ano-

Another argument is brought *Joh.*20. compared with *Luk.*23. 56. to prove, That the first day of the week was not observed by *Mary* as a *rest*, because they bought spices on that day. To which I answer, that as yet Christ had not appeared to them, nor declared his minde for observation of that day; and therefore no marvel if they did not observe it as a day of holy *rest*. 2. I answer, That the spices were not prepared on the first day of the week, but on the sixth, and they rested on the Sabbath, which was not as then abrogated or altered. But never do we read of buying, or selling, or fishing upon the first day of the week, after the Lord Jesus had appeared to his Disciples after his Resurrection.

Further, the Author alledgeth *Act.* 20.7. and saith, it is not powerful enough to constitute a Sabbath. To this I answered in the beginning of this fourth Section or Chapter. And though he say, That the phrase, *breaking of bread*, κλάσαι ἄρτον, in no place is used for the Lord's Supper: he is greatly mistaken. For he may read that phrase, *Mat.*26.26. *Mar.*14.23. 1 *Cor.*10.16. & 11.24. which cannot otherwise be understood but of the Supper. And in this very place, *Act.*20.7. the Syriack reads it, They came together to break the *Eucharist*, or Lord's *Supper*. Indeed, that breaking of bread mentioned, *v.*11. is readred by the Syriack, as breaking of common bread for our usual repast. And whereas the Author saith, that the phrase of breaking bread is first used, *Luk.*24.35. and that it hath reference unto *Mar.*16.14. where it is said, that the eleven were at supper in *Jerusalem*: he is guilty of a double mistake. For *Mark* makes mention of breaking bread with his Disciples after the Passeover, & that mentioned by *Luke*, was his breaking bread at *Emmaus*. 2. It is another wrong to say, that the breaking bread, *Luk.*24.35. is to be refered unto *Mar.*16.14. For the one was *Emmaus*, the other at *Jerusalem*. And there was onely two Disciples in the one place, and eleven in the other. Besides, *Mark* saith, They were at supper in *Jerusalem*; but says not a word of breaking bread. But if all were true as he relates it, yet it would argue nothing against our Lords day: only I note the mistakes, that the Reader may not relie too much upon the credit of the Author.

And whereas he saith, That the Supper was first administred upon the week days: I answer, that grant it so to be, what will that weaken the morality of the first day, or Christian rest, or our breaking bread thereupon? The place alledged, *Rev.*1.10. where the Apostle speaks of the Lords day, I would not press it as a demonstrative argument,

for

for ſanctification of the 1 day of the week; yet if we compare it with 1 *Cor.* 11.20. as the Syriack reads it, it may be a *cumulative* argument, or an argument *ex abundanti*: for the Apoſtle there reproving the abuſe of their love-feaſts, ſaith, *When ye come together into one place*, this is *not to eat the Lords ſupper*. In the Syriack it is read, *When ye come together, ye do that which is not lawful on the Lords day*: ye eat, and ye drink, *&c.* Which implies thus much, that in thoſe primitive times, when that Tranſlation was made (the Apoſtles ſome of them ſtill living) it was the practice of the Churches, to celebrate the *Supper* upon the *Lords day*. Now that the Saints did break bread upon the firſt day of the week, is evident, *Act.* 20.7. and other places.

To the fifth Chapter.

This Chapter ſpeaks moſtly to ſinging, anoynting with Oyl, and a holy kiſs; but theſe do nothing concern the day of Sabbath, to prove the morality of it, either upon the firſt day or laſt day of the week, and therefore I wave them. Only I muſt note ſomething of that kiſs, which he ſaith may be in publick, either before or after Prayer, Love-feaſts, or Lords Supper; as a token of perfect unity, love, conjugal affection, and ſingleneſs of heart, *&c.* But if ſuch practices be uſed amongſt Saints at ſuch times, and for ſuch ends, (for which he brings no Scripture-proof, only he ſaith it) let ſober humble Chriſtians judge how ſuitable, or rather how unſuitable it would be for a divine Ordinance. Touching the Sabbath he ſaith nothing, ſaving that he tells us how Antichriſt, the little Horn, hath deſtroyed both the ſecond and fourth Commandment. Which, let it be granted; yet it proves nothing for the ſeventh day Sabbath, nor againſt our Lords day.

To the ſixth Chapter.

I finde nothing in this Chapter that is argumentative to the ſubject in hand. He tells us of the offence which the Jews took at Chriſt's Diſciples for plucking of ears of corn on the Sabbath day; and againſt Chriſt himſelf, for curing a blinde man upon that day. But thoſe Scriptures ſpeak nothing to the perpetuity or morality of the ſeventh day Sabbath: only they prove that the Jews were ſuperſtitiouſly ſtrict in the obſervation of that day. As for the ſtories he tells

out

out of *Purchase*, touching the Jewish superstitious observations of the Sabbath, and the story of a Sabbatical River that ceaseth running on that day (which is fabulous) they make nothing to the point. Then he concludes that Chapter with this Christian motion, That all Disputes about this subject might be decided by Scripture; which I do also heartily desire, and close with him therein.

To the seventh Chapter.

The last Chapter saith as little to the proof of the Point, as the former; only now and then names the word *Sabbath*, with some allusions to the Saints eternal rest with Christ: and therefore I pass it over. And in the close of all, he adds a Postscript, wherein I finde only this *memento*, That for the first three hundred yeers after Christ, *Infant baptism*, and the *first day Sabbath*, will hardly be found. He means, I suppose, in Ecclesiastical Histories. And what if they be not found at all? will that be any good argument, either against the one, or for the other? much less will it prove the continuance of the seventh Sabbath. These three last Chapters, and also the first, I would have past as impertinent to the question; but that some, who are over-much affected with any thing written in favor of that opinion, might have thought they had been purposely omitted, because of some matter of weight therein contained.

Thus have I, according to my slender measure, traced the Author through his whole Discourse, and not omitted any thing willingly, that seems to speak to the Point. And in answering to the Particulars, I have dealt as candidly and mildly as I could; hoping that the Author himself, nor any that are tender and conscientious, will take this, my labour, in ill part, since my aim and scope is to be helpful to them, to shew them their mistakes, and to strenghthen such as are wavering and doubtful.

FINIS.

BRITISH 15NO86 MUSEUM